

COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC/PUBLIC SAFETY

February 8, 2005

5:30 PM

Chairman Sysyn called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Sysyn Guinta (arrived late), Smith, Forest, O'Neil

Messrs.: Alderman Lopez, Jay Taylor, Dick Anagnost, Jeff Frost, Tom Lolicata, Bill Jabjiniak, Fire Chief Kane, Bob MacKenzie, Sgt. Shawn Fournier, Deputy City Solicitor Arnold

Chairman Sysyn addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. Report of the Committee on Traffic/Public Safety recommending the Board approve a five-year agreement between the City of Manchester and Cameron Real Estate, Inc. for leasing parking spaces in the Victory Parking Garage.

Alderman Forest moved for discussion. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Sysyn stated this item was referred back to Committee because we had a letter from Dick Anagnost and there's one from Cameron Real Estate also. Any questions?

Alderman O'Neil asked for the record who prepared this quick fact sheet?

Clerk Normand replied I believe it was Jay Taylor as a consultant for Cameron Real Estate.

Alderman O'Neil stated can I ask Mr. Taylor where he got his information from?

Chairman Sysyn asked, Jay, can you come up front.

Alderman O'Neil stated I guess what I'm looking for, Jay, is how accurate and up-to-date is it do you believe.

Mr. Taylor replied the parking statistics I got from David Jerome at the Victory Garage. So, those are current based on his analysis.

Alderman O'Neil stated of the last couple of weeks.

Mr. Taylor stated I believe he went back several months.

Alderman O'Neil stated so they're fairly accurate.

Mr. Taylor stated the revenue figures I got from Denise at Traffic and those represent revenue figures from July 1 through December 31, 2004. So, if you wanted to annualize those I suppose you could multiply them by 2, but those are six-month figures.

Alderman Lopez stated thank you, Madame Chair, for allowing me to speak on this because at the full Board I brought some things to the attention of the Committee and voted to send it back to Committee, so I think an explanation would be in order if it's okay with the Committee. I'm concerned that given exclusive rights for 70 parking spaces when other people in the City might need parking spaces of the influx of businesses downtown and Dick Anagnost's letter speaks for itself...if you want to hear from him because it's a City building that we're talking about that if he doesn't have the parking spaces and he can't fill that then the City loses.

Mr. Taylor asked do you wish me to address that?

Chairman Sysyn replied yes.

Mr. Taylor stated in the new lease which I believe you now have the owner of Cameron Real Estate has stipulated that if, in fact, there are agreements that precede his by date specifically Chase Block he has agreed that his rights would become subordinate to any existing agreement. Which in my mind, at least, takes the Chase Block argument out of consideration because if the Chase Block needs spaces ahead of his agreement they get them.

Chairman Sysyn stated that would take care of Dick's because I think his predates Cameron Real Estate.

Alderman Lopez stated I think that's the problem. I think the only person that could testify to that would be Dick or Bill Jabjiniak.

Chairman Sysyn requested Mr. Anagnost to come forward.

Mr. Anagnost stated for the record as Property Manager for the Chase Block as you are aware is owned by the City of Manchester. By way of giving you some background when we originally were approaching the redevelopment of the Chase Block one of the things that was called into question as to its viability was the availability of parking. When I was going to be developing the Chase Block as a private developer not in partnership with the City the original development agreement called for 100 spaces to be reserved in the Victory Garage, Hartnett Lot or across the street in the Canal Street Garage which is no longer available for the use of the Chase Block. When it reverted to a partnership with the City and the City owning the property...there was simply a letter placed on file with Traffic that Chase Block would receive a preference for up to 100 spaces and to this date the traffic problem downtown hasn't gotten any better it's actually gotten worse. So, what precipitated my letter was monitoring the agendas...I noticed that the Cameron request had come across and what I simply was doing was bringing to the Board's attention that the City's own property and the continued viability of the City's owned property depends on the availability of those spaces. Our agreement goes back to sometime in '98 in the Development Agreement and in '99 when we started under the City's auspices of redeveloping that property, so I don't know if Cameron's is dated today that it definitely would predate that agreement. Do you have any other questions?

Chairman Sysyn stated I think Cameron would give you the preference according to the way he's speaking. How many spaces do you have already in that building?

Mr. Anagnost replied I think there's about 53 that are rented by either us directly on behalf of a tenant or by a tenant in that garage.

Alderman O'Neil stated, Dick, that's for the Chase Block...give me those numbers again.

Mr. Anagnost stated we have up to 100 spaces. Currently, there are approximately 53 that's either leased by a tenant directly from the City that we've arranged or that we've leased under Chase Block provided within the rent.

Alderman O'Neil asked what about the Bond Building?

Mr. Anagnost replied the Bond Building only has about 6 spaces in there directly.

Alderman O'Neil stated that are directly as the developer that you have rented.

Mr. Anagnost replied correct.

Alderman O'Neil asked are some of your tenants there on direct leases then with the City.

Mr. Anagnost replied they could be yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated I know you served an advisory role to Mr. Smith's project and I don't know why I'm drawing a blank for the name of it...Dunlap Building... at Amherst and Elm, do you know if there are any agreements for parking there?

Mr. Anagnost replied originally he had 23 spaces that he was renting I don't know what he might have today.

Chairman Sysyn stated I don't think that there is a waiting list for permit leasing at this point. Tom might know. No, there's no waiting list right now so I don't think you have a problem. Any other questions?

Alderman Smith stated we only have an 85% occupancy rate...Dick, you stated that you've only used Chase Building agreement with parking for '99 for six years and you haven't been able to add sufficient parking in those six years and apparently the economic situation doesn't require any more tenants using the space right now.

Mr. Anagnost stated right now the Chase Block is 75% occupied and we lost a couple of big tenants last year and are endeavoring to lease that space back up. One of the tenants that moved on had at least 18 additional spaces so that would have brought us up to 71. The 100 is sufficient to cover it we just don't want you to neglect the fact that capacity is necessary up to that 100 in order to continue to keep Chase Block viable.

Alderman Smith stated I would like to ask Tom Lolicata...Tom, in this letter that was sent out by the real estate firm or the owner that's leasing that...is 127 spaces open at all times presently right now and he's asking for 29 additional, is that correct?

Mr. Tom Lolicata, Director of Traffic, replied the only difference between these two right now...the Manager has an idea of who is with 889 Elm Street because they go through one person and he has the names naturally. In regards to the Chase Block we don't know exactly how many until he just mentioned it tonight. Dave Jerome, I guess, doesn't know if somebody's coming in stating that they are at the Chase Block...he has no idea...if we can get a start on this so we can have an idea that would be very helpful. That's the only difference between these two.

Chairman Sysyn stated one other point I wanted to make is the reason that this came back to the Committee was that some of the Aldermen wanted to put a premium on people who were reserving spaces when they needed them and I don't think we need to put a premium price on that. I think you're discouraging businesses from coming downtown in that sense. I don't think that they should have to pay a premium for having extra spaces which could be reserved because they do pay the full monthly rate for each space that they use.

Alderman Smith stated there's presently no waiting list...Tom, when was the last time somebody requested a sufficient number like this for leasing?

Mr. Lolicata replied for that particular garage...actually, recently we've had one who's been asking as of lately over the last couple of weeks. Before that it's been quite a while.

Alderman Smith stated what I'm looking for...I believe the parking garages are there for availability...there's only 85%, I'd like to see it 95% because of potential revenue that we're losing and if somebody is willing to take a lease, have no qualms about that, it's up to the other individuals who lease it while it's available at this present time.

Mr. Lolicata stated I would like to make a comment regarding that though. The reason we left it open for dailies is for all of the people who go downtown. Those 127 spaces are utilized to 250 to 300 dailies utilizing those spaces. In other words, some people go down for one hour, half-hour, two hours, three hours...those spaces have been utilized by these dailies and the income has been pretty decent. It's not like a permit, but for those people they've been utilized pretty well. Mr. Jerome said they average almost 250 to 300 daily on those spaces.

Alderman O'Neil stated if I could ask Bill Jabjiniak to come forward, please. Bill, you've been involved hands on with the Chase, Bond and Dunlap Buildings in the rehabilitation of those buildings in which the City is either owned or somehow a partner or indirectly a partner...to the best of your knowledge are there any... Mr. Anagnost mentioned that to the best of his knowledge there were only 6 directly leased from his firm on the Bond Building. Are you aware of other tenants and that in lease agreements they may have on the garage?

Mr. Bill Jabjiniak, Destination Manchester Coordinator, replied I will tell you there are individuals like, for example, in the Dunlap Building who have leased spaces directly from the City and again that's not necessarily going to fall under our control but the availability allowed him to fill his building. But, I am not aware of any other formula agreements if that's the question.

Alderman O'Neil asked are there agreements in Chase, Dunlap or Bond that require us to hold a certain number of spaces? Mr. Anagnost mentioned 100 for the Chase Building, are there any other agreements in the Bond or Dunlap.

Mr. Jabjiniak replied no there is not.

Alderman Forest stated according to the memo that Jay Taylor gave us there are 147 parking spots in that Victory Garage. Now, Chase Building supposedly has 100 and Mr. Cameron had a contract for 41 but he wants 71 in all, 70 okay that drops it down...so, that leaves 671 spots in the garage and you stated that there were 300 monthly's already, that leaves another 376 spots that are not rented so that takes care of your 300 dailies even if we do sign this contract and I believe... I'd rather see a signed contract for 70 and 100 spots than to take our chances on a monthly basis. At least this is a guarantee for five or six years.

Alderman Lopez stated I have just one other question because I'll be voting on this at the full Board...Bill, could you explain to me why when we have an influx of businesses coming to Manchester why we would give a 5-year and two 5-year options for 29 additional spaces to one company and go through the rigmarole of trying to get other spaces for other companies, do you follow my question?

Mr. Jabjiniak replied let me take a crack at it and you can correct me if I'm going in the wrong direction. As we solicit new businesses to come down their major interest is obviously parking. When you compete against a Bedford that has parking at the front door, in essence, the availability of parking is what's important and to date we have been able to meet that demand by putting them in the various garages or various lots that we have available but we're nearing a capacity. The request here is to maintain (I'm going to use round numbers) 40 spaces and have the availability to go after 30 more. That is not a guaranteed revenue stream. It's as he needs those 30 spaces the way I understand it he will then pay for those 30 spaces and gentlemen correct me if I'm wrong with that. I think that it's important that everyone have the opportunity to bring their business down here and solicit parking when it's available whether it's in Wall Street, whether it's in the Chase building, whether it's in 889 Elm Street or any of the other ones that are out here. So, that's my thought and let the market sort of correct itself.

Alderman O'Neil stated I guess this is more a statement than a question but what I think we're going to reach some common ground this evening and that Mr. Anagnost is protected, that the Cameron development is protected on this. What I'm concerned about though is that we are starting to push things a little bit with the Victory Garage and there is definitely some disconnect on the City side because we actually had to get information prepared by the private sector first. So,

department's aren't sharing information with one another and I'm concerned about that. I'm also concerned that the potential is there and we've already seen it happen in the Millyard where people made an investment in the Millyard ten years ago, entered into agreements with the City for on-street or off-street parking permits and because another project comes along we've now flooded the area to help project #2 at the cost of project #1 and those people made a commitment to us when nobody else was willing to go in the Millyard. So, somehow we've got to have a mechanism in place to keep an eye on this. I don't know what it is, I don't have the answers tonight I'd ask staff to look at that but at some point we are going to reach a number where we're not going to be able to do anymore leases. Maybe we will, maybe we won't. I guess that's kind of a good thing then. But, I know it has happened in the Millyard where we have over committed at the cost of hurting businesses. A business that has been down there for 10 years that counts on both on-street and off-street parking is telling me that they are losing customers. I just referred it to the Mayor's Office this week and they made a substantial commitment to the Millyard. We need to make sure that that doesn't happen here or in any of our lots, so I'd ask Traffic Department, Bill, Jane and anyone else that's involved to get together and try to come up with some mechanism...the biggest thing that I think, I know the Finance Department is out for a parking study and hopefully what we get back is a true picture of what's happening with our parking system because I'm not sure we really do know what's going on out there. This number of 775 monthly parking leases is significantly different than the number I was told last week.

Chairman Sysyn called for a motion to recommend acceptance of the agreement.

Alderman O'Neil stated it is without a premium, correct.

Chairman Sysyn replied that is correct.

Deputy City Solicitor Arnold stated I, along with the Clerk's Office, want to be clear what the vote is. This particular agreement you have in front of you does provide for a premium. If you want to do that, I would have to do another agreement and that's what I want to be clear on.

Chairman Sysyn stated the motion is to accept the 5-year agreement between the City of Manchester and Cameron Real Estate also includes Dick for the Chase Building, I guess.

Deputy City Solicitor Arnold stated I guess what I would suggest then is I could modify the agreement that you had last week merely to provide for the Chase Block's priority because that agreement did not have a premium.

Alderman O'Neil stated this has to be going forward, not going backwards.

Chairman Sysyn stated we're not going backwards.

Alderman O'Neil stated we have an agreement with the Chase Block, we have an agreement plain and simple.

Chairman Sysyn stated we have an agreement with the Chase Block and now you're going to renew the agreement with Cameron and the agreement with the Chase Block supercedes the Cameron one. That is what you're doing but you're not saying that they're paying a premium for holding those spaces, that is discouraging businesses from coming in.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Forest, it was voted to recommend that the Board approve a five-year agreement between the City of Manchester and Cameron Real Estate, Inc. for leasing parking spaces in the Victory Parking Garage as enclosed herein, and that the Mayor be authorized to execute same subject to the review and approval of the City Solicitor.

Clerk Normand noted Alderman Guinta arrival.

Chairman Sysyn addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. Discussion relative to Enhanced State 911 System.

Alderman Forest moved for discussion. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman O'Neil asked, Chief, do you have any information for us?

Chief Joe Kane, Manchester Fire Department, stated just to bring you up-to-date we did get this just a couple of weeks ago and since then we have been in contact with 911 in Concord and have been doing some research on our own through both our Dispatch Center and the Police Dispatch Center and I have a meeting tomorrow morning with 911 in Concord along with the Police Chief and we're moving along on the issue and we'll need to report back at the next meeting.

Alderman O'Neil stated just a question for the Chief. Joe, in your discussion or brief discussion with folks in Concord had they heard of this concern before?

Chief Kane replied they've heard this concern before. I think what we're going to try to do is narrow down what the concern is and what the issue necessarily is in the operation to see if we can shorten that time period.

Alderman Forest stated I also have some concerns that Alderman O'Neil has. I know I've called the 911 number and at least the young lady that I talked to a year ago and this was regarding a pedestrian accident...that person was more concerned as to who I was, how old I was and all this stuff...at the time at least I ended the conversation by saying send me an ambulance and I think the concern of the victim or the patient I think has to come first and then the dispatcher can get the information after. I don't think that's been happening and I've had the same complaints as Alderman O'Neil.

Chief Kane stated I think that I'm personally narrowing the problem down and as I've been looking at this a lot closer and identifying issues and I think I've got a handle and will be talking with the 911 Director tomorrow and maybe bringing both the City and 911 together with a little committee here in the City to go over these issues. Obviously, these issues are not just with 911 in Manchester these issues are 911 in Nashua, etc.

Alderman Forest stated it was not the Manchester one I had a problem with it was the Enhanced 911.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think we understand the concept of this Enhanced 911, it's a good thing for the State and I know we all pay it in our phone bill monthly but it shouldn't be in the case...like the City of Manchester where we have the emergency services, we've invested in our emergency service resources, we should be able to get a police officer or firefighter or an ambulance responding as soon as possible. I understand that they need to do follow-up, I understand they've helped deliver babies over the phone and helped people walk through CPR but they can still do that and still notifying the local jurisdiction, I think there has to be a way to do that.

Chief Kane stated I really don't want to get into all the details until I've actually sat down and talked to these people.

Alderman O'Neil interjected I think that's pretty much where I think universally where we're coming in Manchester. Don't keep us on the phone and you're not taking any action to notify the local emergency services.

Chief Kane stated there's a number of processes the 911 Dispatchers go through and our dispatchers go through and one of these is called "Call Coding" and those that are "Call Coding" and some of the initial questions that the operator asks at the beginning of the call before the trucks get dispatched and that's what we're, at least what I think I'm identifying is what the problem is here is that that "Call Coding" is taking too much time, number one and the call is not being switched until after the "Call Coding" has taken place. Data comes down but not the phone call. So, I think that that in fact is the problem and we need to look at that and work on that.

On motion of Alderman Forest, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to table item 4 pending further information from the Fire Department.

Chairman Sysyn addressed item 5 of the agenda:

5. Communication from the Public Works Director relative to parking along Line Drive at new ballpark.

Alderman O'Neil moved to recommend that parking along Line Drive be limited to two hours by signage, and that handicapped parking will be limited to two permanent spaces with the ability of the Fisher Cats to place additional temporary handicapped parking signs out during games under the supervision of Police and Traffic Departments. Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil in reference to the last sight asked as that last sight goes before the Planning Board...my understanding is...here's Mr. MacKenzie...Bob, I know you folks met and it seems like you came up with a reasonable recommendation. Is that last parcel, I believe, has to go to the Planning Board or maybe it doesn't?

Mr. Robert MacKenzie, Director of Planning, replied it will have to go to the Planning Board. In that district there is no parking required and at least one proposal I've seen for that did not have any on-site parking because it's a small lot.

Alderman O'Neil stated so that won't be an issue in any way?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I don't believe so.

Alderman O'Neil stated I know in the letter is said that they would be working with the Traffic Department to come up with a sufficient number of handicapped spaces for game day and that's by ordinance so that will have to come back before this Committee, correct?

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes. It didn't make sense to have all of those spaces handicapped for the 90% of the time when the ballfield's not being used. But, it does work I know around the arena where they bag meters for accessible spaces and that seems to work pretty well and we could do the same thing here.

Alderman Smith asked do you know what is required State law for handicapped or disabled parking in a facility like where we are going to have big crowds like three or four thousand, how many spaces are required by law?

Mr. MacKenzie stated we have used in the past up to 3% of available parking spaces. I think that has been reduced in recent changes to maybe 2%. But, the City does not really provide a lot of parking or public parking in that area so we're not bound by that requirement. But, likely we will have to have a couple dozen spaces available for ADA accessibility in that area during major events.

Alderman Forest stated I think we were having that problem with both Gill Stadium because the State had a minimum requirement for handicapped and I think Gill Stadium only allowed for 2 and I know they ended up with more than that and the Verizon maybe be it was a little more than 2 but again they're handicapped spaces were not adequate which is why we got the bags in there and I think that's the same thing that is going to happen with the new ballpark. I don't think what the State requirements are adequate to cover the amount of handicapped people that are going to go to these games and I think that that is what we have to do as the Traffic Committee.

Mr. MacKenzie stated not all of them probably that one row that you see on that drawing that is shown now as handicapped, it's likely that one row...

Alderman Guinta interjected and on the other side is going to be free parking. So, if that's 2-hour parking...you're at a game, you fill the meter for two hours...

Alderman O'Neil interjected they're not recommending meters, they're recommending...

Alderman Guinta stated so if you're there more than two hours then what happens?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I think that was the compromise that was reached between the perspective developer of the small retail site and the baseball stadium. The restaurateur said if I don't have any parking spaces during games my business is going to be hurt, so they agreed to two hours, both groups.

Chairman Sysyn called for a vote on the motion to approve. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Sysyn addressed item 6 of the agenda:

6. Discussion relative to safety concerns at Fire Station #6 located at 134 Amory Street.

Chairman Sysyn asked does anyone want to question anybody on this, did anything happen...Joe Kane is here.

Alderman Forest stated I'll make a comment to both Tom and the Chief. This is mainly brought up by Alderman Thibault and I sort of concurred with his concern. Engine 6 either as they're exiting the firehouse or backing up into the firehouse... it's mainly for the west bound traffic. As you're coming up Amory Street you're at the crest of the hill and it sort of levels off then when it levels off the firehouse is right there and I know that Alderman Thibault had some concerns about cars coming up Amory Street and maybe getting involved in an accident with either the trucks exiting or backing up or coming back into the fire station. I think that is why we asked Tom to look at maybe we can put a blinking light or a traffic light like some of the other firehouses and I think it's one of the few in the City that doesn't have one and I know, Tom, I think you said it was expensive.

Mr. Lolicata stated we went over there and Jim Hoben came up with some figures. I talked to the Chief and I talked to the personnel over at Engine 6 and their biggest one was backing in believe it or not. The cheapest way to do this that we come up with...a figure around \$35,585 right now with an aerial span that includes two mast arms...that's the cheapest way to get out of this and the best way for them to observe those lights coming east and west bound. Joe got an e-mail today as a matter of fact from Jim explaining this. The only thing now is if you want to go forward with this we have to get some money from CIP or somebody.

Alderman Forest moved to refer item 6 relative to safety concerns at Fire Station # 6 to the Committee on Community Improvement for funding. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil stated I know the Mayor has started the budget process for the next fiscal year. If everybody agreed on it we could always get it as an expedited project. I know originally when Tom looked at it he was trying to look and he's right there are a lot of side streets that come into play but when you think about it you've got people up at Derryfield, for instance, at Engine 10 you've got people exiting the parking lot across the street, I think it's more to kill that through traffic and the firefighters use caution just coming out on some of those...I think there's a little side alley isn't there Tom right tot he east of the fire station as soon as they come out.

Mr. Lolicata interjected there's two of them actually plus two side streets.

Alderman O'Neil stated they just have to use caution but hopefully the people are stopped because they should stop anyway on Amory Street when they see the fire trucks exiting. So, I think it would be a good move and if we could refer it to CIP.

Chairman Sysyn called for a vote on the motion to refer to CIP Committee. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Sysyn addressed item 7 of the agenda:

7. Discussion relative to snow emergency citations and possible increase of fines.

Chairman Sysyn stated I believe we've discussed this, it came up in January and we referred it to Highway and Police.

Alderman Forest moved for discussion. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman O'Neil stated I know they were working on and I see Police, Highway and Traffic here...they were working on a recommendation. I think one of the concerns was that if there's a snow emergency and they don't get to a car currently there is only a \$25.00 fine but really the people can get four of those in the course of a year...I think we need to put some teeth into it, the fact of the matter is and Sgt. Fournier probably can report on this but there aren't enough wreckers, we're still only going to be able to tow between 250 and 300 cars a storm, why that happens I don't know but people have to get off the street or at least get in their pocket to get off the street so we can do snow removal properly.

Mr. Lolicata stated we did meet...Highway, myself and Police Department and Planning and we have come up with a recommendation and thought maybe \$50.00 would be more to it. It is not the greatest bite in the world but there is a bite there. We've got to start thinking of the people themselves...we thought \$50.00 would be fair. Something has got to be done and we figured \$50.00 as fair.

Alderman O'Neil stated, Tom, they're still getting two...you get two of those tickets and it's still cheaper than if you get towed because it's \$110.00 now if you get towed. I thought you might come back with something up in the \$75.00 range to be honest with you where that would put some bite in their pocket.

Mr. Lolicata stated we had all recommendations from \$100.00 down to \$50.00 at the least and then it was the final analysis of the four of us. If this Committee wants to go forward and put more bite into it, this is just our recommendation.

Alderman O'Neil stated it can't be \$50.00 and \$100.00 it's one fine.

Alderman Forest interjected well one for all night parking and the other one for snow removal.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't think they took a look at all night parking. Did you take a look at all night parking fine as well?

Chairman Sysyn stated this is just snow emergencies.

Alderman O'Neil stated I guess what is unfortunate is that generally speaking it can be many of the same people get towed every storm. Even though you can call the Police Department or the Highway Department 24 hours-a-day to find out if there's a snow emergency on. You can get on an e-mail list that notifies you when there's a snow emergency, but some people just insist and they take the chance that a police officer is going to come by and tag the car or that there's a wrecker available and maybe they won't get towed this week or maybe they will and I just know in many, many sections of the City on some pretty main drags there are still cars that you can still see the remnants of the snow plow having to go around them because the Police Department and the Highway Department just didn't get to enough vehicles. My personal opinion is I would like to see it at \$75.00, that's my personal opinion.

Chairman Sysyn stated this was recommended by the staff committee that worked on it.

Alderman Forest stated I have a comment and mainly it's from some of the complaints that I've received and in my own personal opinion that during a snow emergency when a car gets towed they're charging them \$110.00 to get their car back and like Alderman O'Neil says you have this other guy who's probably had three snow storms and they've gotten one ticket and the ticket's \$25.00 and I think maybe you ought to put some teeth into it...the \$75.00 I sort of agree with, but if you're going to charge somebody \$110.00 for a tow charge you should at least charge them \$75.00 if they're going to be there all night during an emergency. So, I think the \$75.00 is adequate.

Alderman Smith stated first of all this was unanimous your figure of \$50.00, right, any figure is arbitrary but it was unanimous between the three and four departments.

Mr. Lolicata stated at that time.

Alderman Smith stated one comment I would like to make is you can put as much teeth in it you want, as much fun as you want and the Police Department cannot tag every car in a snow emergency. I'll say in the outskirts, not the inner-city, first their priority is to clean out cars that are parking illegally in the City so they can plow. So, more than likely half the cars are parked out in the suburban areas or out by say my ward, out by Bedford and won't be tagged at all because the Police are being utilized in the City to tag and tow these cars.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't disagree with what Alderman Smith is saying. I did have a discussion with Lt. Valenti about one of the storms this year and a personal experience for him they called for a car to be towed, one car down on Charlotte Street which I believe is down by Trolley Crossing or somewhere down in there and what would have made sense and I don't want to speak for the Lieutenant but this is the discussion we had...he said what would have made sense would have been to send a regular route police officer, not somebody involved with the snow removal operation down to put a tag on that car, but \$25.00 didn't really have any bite into it. If they've got to...and I still believe in a \$75.00 ticket...the route police officer puts a \$75.00 ticket on that car, I doubt we're going to have a problem in front of that house again but I think it's something Sgt. Fournier may want to comment on but I think they've talked about how can they with these remote areas can they better utilize the 24-hour police officers that are out there and not put it all on the police officers that are assigned to the towing operations.

Sgt. Shawn Fournier, Traffic Division of the Manchester Police Department, stated as you're aware the issue of these parking citations during snow emergencies in lieu of towing the vehicle quite frequently we're not able to get to all of the vehicles in the City in terms of towing them off the streets...the two lots I think presently hold of about 330 vehicles depending on the storm and how everything is laid out. But, honestly, given enough time we could triple that but we just don't have the resources in terms of space available and during the course of a snow emergencies we do have to make priorities in terms of what streets we want to hit first so the Highway Department can go in and do their job and some of these outer areas of City as well. Some areas that might be of secondary concerns...that is when we have to look at issuing these parking citations. The route officers are out there on the midnight shift during snow emergencies in the course of conducting their normal calls for service they're coming across a lot of these vehicles and they can issue these citations and clearly a \$25.00 fee doesn't seem to be much of an issue these days that is why we recommend that it be raised to \$50.00. The Board does feel that number should be increased to \$75.00 we would also support that as you indicated the tow amount currently is \$110.00 and that's in lieu of being towed.

Chairman Sysyn asked what do you want?

Alderman O'Neil moved that the penalties for violations of snow emergency winter parking be increased to \$75.00. Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman O'Neil stated just a question. Alderman Forest brought up although we didn't ask them to look at it, he brought up an issue about overnight parking.

Alderman Forest stated Sgt. Fournier is aware of the one that I was talking to you about, that's the truck that was on English Village Road that's been there every weekend for I don't know how many months, but it's strictly an all night parking problem and the people who have called me are aware that your officer has been tagging this vehicle on a regular basis but the vehicle continues to be there and I know I called you the other day on it and the people called me up and they said your officer went up there and tagged them like clockwork. Every weekend that vehicle is still there and that's one of the other comments that I had just made about increasing the all night parking fine also, but it doesn't seem to affect this person either.

Sgt. Fournier stated probably not in that case. Obviously, that fine amount is \$20.00...when we're looking at the night parking prohibited that's otherwise known as the odd/even...when we looked at it before we looked at it in terms of the snow emergency when we actually have the storm itself.

Alderman O'Neil stated I wish I could take credit for this question but it's actually Alderman Smith's...tickets must be printed up, Shawn, ahead of time...how quickly could the change to \$75.00 be implemented practically.

Sgt. Fournier replied early last week we received another shipment of parking citations...I'll have to check but probably as quick as a couple of weeks. When the fine amount went into effect to the increase in the handicapped violation from \$50.00 to \$250.00 what the officers did in that case was instead of printing up new tickets we just cross it off and we have them write \$250.00.

Alderman O'Neil stated so for some reason, I think, there's some snow expected Thursday or something of this week...we wouldn't have approved it by the full Board so it wouldn't be implemented this week, but after next week if the full Board implements this...so printing up a new parking ticket is not an issue an officer can just make that change.

Sgt. Fournier stated no it's not an issue with us. As soon as you make that approval we'll just have the officers be aware that the new amount is whatever you decide and we'll go from there.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated I just wanted to indicate that that would be an ordinance change and it's a citation, so it will have to layover, so it's probably going to be four weeks before you get it through anyway.

Alderman O'Neil interjected or we can suspend the rules next week.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied not on citations.

Alderman O'Neil stated you can't. Can we poll...

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated I can check with the Solicitor's Office and see what we might be able to do to expedite it.

Alderman O'Neil stated the sooner we do it the better.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated citations can't be...you can't just suspend the rules on a citation.

Alderman O'Neil stated my suggestion would be whatever we can do to keep moving it would be better.

Chairman Sysyn addressed item 8 of the agenda:

8. Communication from Alderman O'Neil relative to installation of traffic signs in residential neighborhoods.

Alderman O'Neil stated I became aware recently of an installation in a residential section of the City of "No Parking" signs in front of a house. There are three signs up...I really didn't pay a lot of attention to it, but a neighbor of this house did and he said to me and it was a comment that really stuck with me...if I wanted to live in a neighborhood with all kinds of signs I'd live downtown...and he said take a look around and I did and there were no other traffic signs around and I tell you they stick out like an eyesore, to be honest with you. I think we need to have a policy that this Board has to adopt...I was talking to Bob MacKenzie about this...we used to be called the Tree City, I think, Bob. We're now the "Sign" City. Every place you drive we have traffic signs...to be honest...

Chairman Sysyn stated you ought to come down Lowell Street near my house.

Alderman O'Neil stated to be honest with you it's ridiculous and I know as a ward Alderman that we all...I was a ward Alderman, we all try to respond to our constituents needs and to be honest with you we probably don't think as thoroughly about some of these situations as we should and it's not a major expense to the City, but I think and would move that we ask the Traffic Director to work with the Planning Director, maybe Police want to be involved but unless there's a safety issue, I think we really have to question putting up some of these traffic signs. I've noticed in my neighborhood now we now have signs that people say "No Parking/Driveway". Well, you can't park in front of a driveway...Sgt. Fournier am I correct, I don't know if that's City ordinance or State law to park in front of a driveway, is that ordinance or State law.

Clerk Normand replied State law.

Alderman O'Neil asked why do we have to put up signs...

Chairman Sysyn interjected because people don't observe.

Alderman O'Neil stated well, if they don't observe then they should call the Police Department and they should be tagged or put up signs to don't park in front of a fire hydrant, State law says you can't park...I don't know what is it 15 feet from the side of a fire hydrant.

Mr. Lolicata asked can I respond to that?

Alderman O'Neil stated give me my 30 seconds of fame here...I'm just saying that it's getting out-of-control the amount of signs we're putting up.

Chairman Sysyn stated there was one you called me on in my ward, I believe.

Alderman O'Neil stated there's a whole other issue about whether Aldermen are actually requesting some of these things, that's a whole other issue.

Chairman Sysyn stated I called Tom on that and he was supposed to rescind it.

Alderman O'Neil stated I thought we passed a motion that the department was not going to take any action on signage, bring it forward. I'll be honest with you. We go through the Consent Agenda, I trust that everything has been cleared with the Alderman when I see an Alderman's name there. I now have some doubts that that in fact has happened. But, I generally think we need to take a look at...we're ruining some of these great neighborhoods in Manchester with signs for no reason. There was no reason that there's "No Parking" in front of this house. It's not a safety concern, we sometimes try to clear an intersection although you can't park under State law within so many feet of a Stop Sign...I don't know why we have to put up all of the signs up all over the place but there has to be some merit behind a sign going up in the City. Certainly for safety issues you won't hear an argument from me but I hate that we're becoming the City of signs.

Chairman Sysyn stated you would like this referred to...

Alderman O'Neil replied I would like it referred to Traffic, Police and Planning to come up with some kind of policy and I would hope the entire Board would give some support to that. I don't know how other Aldermen feel, I've spoken to you about it, Madame Chair, and you agree in some ways that we're starting to ruin some of our great neighborhoods in this City with signs.

Chairman Sysyn stated we had a problem on Beacon Street, I had to have the Building Department, the Police Department...

Mr. Lolicata stated they don't go up unless they're recalled or asked for and I agree with you that this is State law...people still don't obey it and the instance I am going to bring up now is every person tells me...a cop told me to put a sign up or they won't get a ticket, that's the first response I get.

Alderman O'Neil stated well that's an issue for Sgt. Fournier to address.

Mr. Lolicata stated if I had my way I'd take them all out also. I agree with you. Can I ask you in reference to where these signs are that you are specifically talking about.

Alderman O'Neil stated that really triggered this whole thing for me. They're at Beacon Street by Manchester.

Chairman Sysyn stated it's the one at 435...

Mr. Lolicata stated that is the one I called you on when that girl requested those in the front of her house...she's on the top of a hill, Manchester Street dead ends right in front of her house...

Chairman Sysyn interjected the whole neighborhood is up in arms now.

Mr. Lolicata stated she's on top of the hill and she couldn't see coming out of there when people are parked there, she almost got clipped, she's pregnant, she can't even move...

Alderman O'Neil stated I can get clipped coming out of my own driveway...you have to look.

Mr. Lolicata stated I understand that but you have got to see the situation that she was in and...

Alderman Shea stated I know the neighborhood very, very well I grew up there. I don't think there's no safety issue there. We all have to be cautious coming out of our driveways.

Chairman Sysyn stated that was the one I had called you on and you said you would rescind it.

Mr. Lolicata stated I'm going up there and it will be rescinded...that's on your next agenda anyway, so that will be done.

Alderman Forest stated let me plead guilty to a couple of those signs because I know I've asked Tom about it because some people have asked me, in my ward, mainly near a school and one is near a business and the reason I did it is because people were coming to work, people coming parking the schools were blocking their driveways, they weren't in their driveway but Sgt. Fournier may correct me if I'm wrong but I know that some of the ordinances have different measurements like I recall parking in front of a stop sign depending on where you looked was either 6 feet, 15 feet or 20 feet and I don't know if that has changed and I believe the same thing with a driveway...you're not supposed to park within 6 feet of a driveway but that may be 10 or 15 feet too and that's the main reason why I had some of these signs put up because people can't get out of their driveway and I'm sure that Central High the cars are parked right up to these people's driveways. So, that's why I plead guilty to doing some of these. I sort of agree with Alderman O'Neil that we're doing a lot, I saw one at a house...a "Loading Zone" the other day, I don't know how that got there.

Chairman Sysyn stated I have one that we're talking about putting a "Loading Zone" because there's a girl in a wheelchair and the bus can't drive up to her house to pick her up because everybody's parked there, so you need...

Alderman O'Neil interjected that's a different situation. Some of these things we need to address if, in my opinion if they are issues we need to let the Police Department know of these issues. I know Sgt. Fournier was a patrol supervisor, I know that the patrol supervisors get on the route guys about making sure they address these issues...I came across Belmont Street last week and I think that at every intersection...I'm exaggerating a little bit between Webster and Bridge but there's a stop sign and I don't believe there were high accidents at those corners. I know Tom over the years has taken strong opposition to the number of stop signs we've installed. It was to appease maybe some speed issues. Well, you don't use stop signs to handle a speed issue. You get a police officer up there, they write some tickets and you don't have any problems. I just think that we need to address signs in general and refer it to the three departments to look at...I don't know if Highway wants in on this...I think Police, Traffic and Planning are satisfactory.

Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Forest stated I would just like to add something to it if possible maybe we can add the fact...I don't know if they're still there, it's been a while since I've seen some of the City ordinances and the State laws but maybe with Sgt. Fournier and Tom and all maybe you can look at the difference in the 6 to 15 to 20 to make

sure that all of the ordinances that we have have the same distance...I know I've had trouble with it sometimes whether I tagged a car or didn't tag a car because the ordinance had three different measurements on it.

Mr. Lolicata stated I can do whatever you want just by the book. I have it memorized, they're done correctly.

Alderman Forest stated I used to, I don't anymore.

Mr. Lolicata stated I have to go by the book it's the law.

Alderman Forest stated but a police officer...if there's three different measurements there it's kind of difficult when you get to court to tell the judge that I tagged a vehicle because it was 6 feet from the stop sign when the City ordinance said 20 and then there was another ordinance that said it was 15...you have to come up with some consensus as to what it is and what it should be.

Mr. Lolicata stated State law...30 feet.

Alderman Forest stated okay now you're saying 30.

Mr. Lolicata stated it's always been 30.

Chairman Sysyn called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Sysyn addressed item 9 of the agenda:

9. Chairman Sysyn advises that the Traffic Department has submitted an agenda, which needs to be addressed as follows:

NO PARKING:

On Summer Street, north and south sides, from Elm Street to Willow Street

On Green Street, north and south sides, from Elm Street to Willow Street

On Grove Street, north and south sides, from Elm Street to Willow Street

On W. Auburn Street, south side, from Driveway of Rockwell Automation
Company to a point 75 feet west

(Removal of Meters #119CC and #120CC)

Alderman Guinta

On Beacon Street, west side, from a point 100 feet north of Concord Street to a point 50 feet north (Emergency Act)
Alderman Sysyn

On Belmont Street, west side, from Green Street to a point 70 feet south
Alderman Osborne

On Wellington Road, south side, from Foxwood Circle to Wellington Road
Alderman Porter

On Frederick Street, north side, from Hale Street to a point 55 feet west
Alderman Smith

NO PARKING – NOVEMBER 15 TO APRIL 15 (EMERGENCY ACT):

On Orange Street, south side, from Union Street to Chestnut Street
On Pearl Street, south side, from Chestnut Street to Union Street
Alderman Guinta

NO PARKING (LOADING ZONE):

On Pine Street, east side, from a point 80 feet north of Grove Street to a point 25 feet north
Alderman Guinta

Alderman O'Neil asked have the Aldermen, in fact, asked for these requests?

Mr. Lolicata replied the first ones were by the Police Department and I informed the Alderman. It's a parking situation happening during Verizon events and people can't get through.

Alderman Smith stated my response is they couldn't deliver the mail because there's cars parked there and the Post Office wouldn't deliver the mail.

Alderman O'Neil stated, Tom, you do remember that we did pass something that you're supposed to coordinate with the Aldermen.

Alderman Guinta stated he did.

On motion of Alderman Forest, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to approve the Traffic Department agenda as presented.

NEW BUSINESS

Alderman Guinta stated I have an interesting request. I have a resident here Jeff Frost of Ward 3 who I would like to explain to the Committee what the situation is, he lives on No. Bay, it is downtown so maybe that's a little more exempt from the area that we're talking about in terms of signage but in my view he's got a legitimate issue that I would like to try to resolve for him.

Mr. Jeff Frost, 113 Bay Street, Manchester, NH, stated I live just south of Webster across from the food stand three houses south. We are zoned, I believe, R2PO... we have some signs I'd be more than happy you can take down at anytime for aesthetic reasons in a historical district. It's signs that have been there, I don't know how long, but up until just the last few months of being enforced because it seems like obviously since I've been here in the last 14 years the City has grown and parking is a problem and I think the systemic across the entire City, but in my particular case we are the only residential house that's been in existence for over 100 years there, the rest of the places have been converted in one form or another either to totally commercial, professional office or partial residential. But, what's happened is you have the 1-hour parking signs in front of my house and what happened was 121 Bay Street which was petitioned to be a Montessori School about six months or a year ago was turned down has now been sold to a mortgage company and the mortgage company brought in about 10 to 15 employees and all of a sudden we had a parking problem and 122 Bay Street which I don't know if you know the building used to be Dick Danais' office and building has quite a bit of parking behind it between the alley and Elm Street and they've lost basically... and I can understand the problem that just happened today...they just called the Police because there ended up being no parking on the curbside for any of these businesses because this one particular business has yet to build their parking and I can understand he says he's trying to get a variance for paving in the wintertime. My problem is I need to be able to at least park...if I couldn't park for more than an hour I wouldn't have been able to move in my furniture when I moved in 14 years ago. I use the front of my house as it's been used for the last at least I know 6 years on a constant basis. I've been using it without ever having a ticket for parking in front of it for more than an hour. For work reasons, for other reasons, many reasons...I'm just trying to get a conditional...a long as we're a private home...Residential Parking Permit, so I can park for more than one hour in front of my house and that's basically what is boils down to.

Alderman O'Neil stated if I may, Madame Chair, this is one of those exceptions. Now, that Mr. Frost explained I think there's an accounting firm across the street on the west side of the street...

Mr. Frost stated there's a law firm right to the right of me, I'm on the east side...the odds are on the east, the evens are on the west side...to the north of me which is 121 used to be the convalescent home for the elderly...he found it sold it...Dick Danais was looking at buying it too, but it's a mortgage company and that's what precipitated all this. The firm across the street, Danais' old 122 building is a large building...3-story just south of the fruit stand. They have multiple businesses in there one of them being accounting and then to the left of that is a small colonial which is a law firm and then there's the doctor's office and then the funeral home. In a way, obviously, success is what's happened here in Manchester. When I got here coming back to New Hampshire from the military we didn't have these problems...those places were empty, most of the City was empty and you didn't have a parking problem or snow removal problem or overnight parking. So, it's a good sign but right now it's affecting me and obviously people on the street. One Twenty One Bay supposedly is going to get their parking squared away in the next six months, that's what they've told me. But, it hasn't changed my need for more than an hour parking...it was kind of a surprise to me when we got the tickets...I had a trailer parked out there and was doing my lawn work and I think I went inside for lunch and came back and there was a ticket there and like I said this is the first one since I've been there and I know that the Beaudry's who lived there for forty something years used it as access to their private property. So, my request would be as long as it's a single-family residential home which it is and I plan on staying there at least until the kids get out of college is that we get two Residential Parking Permits for 113 Bay Street for extended parking beyond one hour.

Alderman Guinta moved to approve two Residential Parking Permits for 113 Bay Street creating new parking zone. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil asked are two parking permits enough. I don't know how old your children are or sometime people visit.

Mr. Frost stated we do have a garage in the back alley. Normally, it's when they're left there. I think two would probably be enough...sometimes, my mother-in-law comes over and stays.

Alderman O'Neil stated it's generally an issue Monday through Friday from 8:00 to 5:00.

Mr. Frost stated yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated I would like to see him get a little more relief than maybe three spaces.

Mr. Frost stated we have 122 feet of frontage.

Alderman O'Neil asked is 122 feet enough for three spaces theoretically?

Alderman Smith stated, Mr. Frost, this is going to be conditional upon the company building their parking lot.

Mr. Frost replied I would hope that the condition with our house maintain a private residence. It's not a multi-use...we're the only single-family and we're taxed as such on the highest tax basis of that whole south of Webster/Bay Street...there's only three blocks. I'm the only single-family residence left. I would say it being conditional as a single-family residence and after that I can understand requiring parking in front if I were to convert it or anybody were to convert it to PO they obviously would have to put in the parking to match that.

Alderman O'Neil asked is there a process...I'm guessing this will go to the full Board next week for approval, is there a process Mr. Frost has to do to get the permits.

Clerk Normand stated, Madame Chair, Deputy City Solicitor Arnold has something to add to this discussion.

Deputy City Solicitor Arnold stated it's going to take an ordinance change.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated can I just follow-up a little bit on that. It's an ordinance change he has indicated and I don't think you want to limit it to a single-family residence or to a specific single-family home. I understand it's businesses but we would just put it as a Residential Parking Permit and set up a zone for it under the ordinance and then he could obtain a Residential Parking Permit basically for any vehicle that is tied to a residential which would be in his instance, however. We could put it as a one-block area and then if there happens to be others that have an apartment or something along that way they would also be eligible.

Alderman O'Neil stated we'd make the zone as limited as possible to address this need.

Chairman Sysyn stated you'll have others that will ask for those too because I've had people...

Alderman Guinta stated I can't think of any other areas at least in downtown that are identical to this circumstance. Literally, his home is surrounded by commercial or businesses and I don't think there is any other street that has that situation. So, I don't know that we're actually going to get...

Mr. Frost stated Chestnut street runs parallel next block and they don't have this parking at all and they have a mixed use there. I don't understand...there is no zoning under residential/professional that allows a parking permit. I know Boston has it and other cities.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated our laws are different than Boston's but we can create something that will address the situation and we'll certainly submit that to the Board at the next meeting. It is an ordinance change, the rules could be suspended and that one could be adopted, its not a penalty ordinance. But, we'll see what we can put together to address it. I think we have a clear understanding of what the Committee's trying to address and I think it meets the general provisions of that ordinance. It's strictly a City ordinance.

Chairman Sysyn calls for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

TABLED ITEM

10. Report of the Traffic Committee recommending that all metered parking be changed from Monday-Friday, 8AM-8PM to Monday-Friday, 8AM-6PM.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Forest, it was voted to remove item 10 from the table for discussion.

Alderman O'Neil stated with the pending traffic study I hope this matter will be addressed at that time and I move to receive and file item 10. Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, on motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee